UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/870,613	05/31/2001	Scott J. Broussard	AUS920010261US1	1790

35617 7590 03/15/2004

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
P.O. BOX 684908
AUSTIN, TX 78768

EXAMINER	
BONSHOCK, DENNIS G	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	3

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PR4

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/870,613	Applicant(s) BROUSSARD, SCOTT J.	
	Examiner Dennis G Bonshock	Art Unit 2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 May 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fults et al., Patent #5,327,529, hereinafter Fults, Slaughter et al., Patent #6,434,694, hereinafter Slaughter and Wilson, *Java Platform Performance*.

3. With regard to claim 1, Fults teaches a display (see figures 14 and 15), and application program adapted to execute from a processor that operates from an operating system (see column 2, lines 10-15 and column 1, lines 25-36), a memory (see column 20, lines 21-39), and a software component that fetches a list of text contained in memory for producing a list upon the display (see column 13, lines 10-15). Fults, however, doesn't teach the display being independent of the OS. Slaughter also teaches the creation of a list, but further teaches the display not dependent on invoking a display routine from the operating system (see column 6, lines 61 through column 7, line 6). Wilson teaches Swing which is Java's version of an OS independent user interface display API, similar to that of Slaughters OS independent control. Wilson further teaches on page 145 Swings pluggable look and feel. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Fults, Slaughter, and Wilson before him at the time the invention was made to modify the list display of Fults

to include the independent display routines of Slaughter and Wilson. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because this independent display provides a common interface no mater which operating system the list is being displayed on.

4. With regard to claim 2, which teaches the application program adapted to operate during runtime, Slaughter further teaches, in column 4, lines 51-59, the application being in a runtime system. With regard to the further teaching of creating a list prior to fetching it from memory, Slaughter further teaches, in column 6, lines 61-67 and column 7, lines 15-20, allocating space for the list prior to populating it.

5. With regard to claim 3, which teaches the list only created once in memory, Wilson teaches the use of Swing, on page 145, which is disclosed in the specification on page 31 to obviate the need for a redundant memory array.

6. With regard to claim 4, which teaches an image upon the display being created independent of the operating system, Wilson teaches, on page 145, Swing having a pluggable look and feel.

7. With regard to claim 5, which teaches a peer component coupled between the software component and a list of java swing component, where the peer component has a pointer for translating call routines, Fults further teaches, in column 24, lines 36 and column 25, line 10 and in figure 21, a peer component between two User Interface components interpreting and routing information. Fults doesn't state specific UI components but Wilson further teaches, on page 145, two user interface components one being AWT and the other being Swing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Fults, Slaughter, and Wilson before him

at the time the invention was made to have the UI element of Fults be the AWT and Swing elements as taught by Wilson. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because AWT and Swing are two UI elements, which provide interfaces that are cross platform.

8. With regard to claims 6 and 15, which teach the peer component emulating some of the behavior of the second peer component adapted to serve as an interface between the software component and the object, Wilson further teaches, on page 149, the similarities between the Swing and AWT components but that for lists with a large number of items Swing is the obvious choice.

9. With regard to claim 7, which teaches the second peer component being part of AWT, Wilson further teaches, on page 149, the second peer component being of AWT.

10. With regard to claim 8, which teaches the system of software components comprising Java swing API, Wilson teaches, on page 145, the use of Swing, a java based API.

11. With regard to claims 9 and 16, which teach the object being part of a graphical user interface associated with the application program, Fults further teaches in column 24, lines 36-50 and in figure 21, the object being part of a GUI associated with an application program.

12. With regard to claim 10, which teaches the object being a choice or list control, in column 13, lines 10-15, the object being a list.

13. With regard to claim 11, which teaches the application program being in java programming language, Slaughter further teaches, in column 4, lines 51-59, the application programs being in a Java virtual environment.

14. With regard to claim 12, Fults teaches a display system (see figures 14 and 15), and application program adapted to execute from a processor that operates from an operating system (see column 2, lines 10-15 and column 1, lines 25-36), a memory (see column 20, lines 21-39), and a software component that fetches a list of text contained in memory for producing a list upon the display (see column 13, lines 10-15). Fults, however, doesn't teach the display being independent of the OS. Slaughter also teaches the creation of a list, but further teaches the display not dependent on invoking a display routine from the operating system (see column 6, lines 61 through column 7, line 6). Wilson teaches Swing which is Java's version of an OS independent user interface display API, similar to that of Slaughters OS independent control. Wilson further teaches on page 145 Swings pluggable look and feel. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Fults, Slaughter, and Wilson before him at the time the invention was made to modify the list display of Fults to include the independent display routines of Slaughter and Wilson. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because this independent display provides a common interface no mater which operating system the list is being displayed on.

15. With regard to claim 13, which teaches creating comprising communication the call routine to lines of code within a peer software component that serves to point to the list file, Fults further teaches, in column 6, lines 61 through column 7, line 6, column 13,

lines 10-15, and in figure 21, a peer component that links two different APIs for use in creating a list on the display.

16. With regard to claim 14, which teaches a peer software component that serves to point to the list file within memory, Fults further teaches, in column 6, lines 61 through column 7, line 6, column 13, lines 10-15, and in figure 21, a peer component that links two different APIs for use in creating a list on the display.

17. With regard to claim 17, Fults teaches a computer readable medium comprising: an application program adapted to execute from a processor that operates from an operating system (see column 2, lines 10-15 and column 1, lines 25-36), a memory (see column 20, lines 21-39), and a software component that fetches a list of text contained in memory for producing a list upon the display (see column 13, lines 10-15), and this list containing item selectable by the user (see column 8, lines 45-55). Fults, however, doesn't teach the display being independent of the OS. Slaughter also teaches the creation of a list, but further teaches the display not dependent on invoking a display routine from the operating system (see column 6, lines 61 through column 7, line 6). Wilson teaches Swing which is Java's version of an OS independent user interface display API, similar to that of Slaughters OS independent control. Wilson further teaches on page 145 Swings pluggable look and feel. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Fults, Slaughter, and Wilson before him at the time the invention was made to modify the list display of Fults to include the independent display routines of Slaughter and Wilson. One would have

been motivated to make such a combination because this independent display provides a common interface no mater which operating system the list is being displayed on.

Conclusion

18. The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(c) to consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited therein teach systems for linking APIs in an operating environment.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis G Bonshock whose telephone number is (703) 305-4668. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m..

20. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (703) 308-3116. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

21. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JOHN CABECA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

dgb